CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUG

TRAFFICKERS ADMITTED TO

THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT

OF CORRECTION

1989 AND 1990

William V. Pelfrey, Ph.D.

TH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CRIME CONTROL AND PUBLIC SAFETY

GOVERNOR'S CRIME COMMISSION

CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUG

TRAFFICKERS ADMITTED TO

THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT

OF CORRECTION

1989 AND 1990

William V. Pelfrey, Ph.D.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CRIME CONTROL AND PUBLIC SAFETY

GOVERNOR'S CRIME COMMISSION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CHARACTERISTICS OF
DRUG TRAFFICKERS SENTENCED
IN
NORTH CAROLINA
IN 1989 AND 1990

Crime and justice have been major societal concerns for decades. In
recent years, drug use and abuse has become the most pressing issue
facing youth and a significant percentage of adults list drug abuse as our
most serious problem. The United States Attorney General stated in an
open letter to the President that "drug trafficking is the number one
crime problem facing our country and the world." In an effort to
understand more about Drug Trafficking, the Governor's Crime Commission
funded this study of the characteristics of drug traffickers admitted to
the North Carolina Carolina Department of Correction. Information was
received from the Department of Correction on each drug trafficker
admitted in 1989 and 1990. The data included demographic, social,
economic and work histories as well as evaluative information and test
results. The State Bureau of Investigation provided criminal histories on
each of the 802 traffickers. The data were coded and computerized where
necessary, merged and analyzed using statistical and patterning
techniques.

The results of the research, summarized below, provides us with the
precise set of characteristics shared by drug traffickers. These
characteristics include demographic, social, economic and criminal traits
and histories. Emerging from these general characteristics are those
which are unique to four categories of drug traffickers.

   o Those with prior drug offense arrests
   o Those with prior violent crime arrests
   o Those with prior property crime arrests
   o Those with no prior arrests

These sets or categories of characteristics are identified for the first
time and represent a significant contribution to the criminological
literature. The analysis is fully provided in the "Final Report to the Crime
Commission: Characteristics of Drug Traffickers Sentenced in North
Carolina in 1989 and 1990." The analysis is summarized below:

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

o In 1989 433 drug traffickers were admitted to the North Carolina Department of Correction

o In 1990 369 drug traffickers were admitted to the Department of Correction

o The average age of the 802 drug traffickers was 33.6 years

o Almost 40 percent of the drug traffickers were White and 52 percent were Black

o More than 89 percent were males

o The drug traffickers had an average of .3 prior imprisonments and an average of 2.6 total arrests

o Traffickers admitted in 1989 received sentences averaging 10.7 years while those admitted in 1990 received average sentences of 10.9 years

o By July, 1991, 42 percent of traffickers admitted in 1989 had been released on parole after serving an average of 15 months of their sentence

o Almost 15 percent of the traffickers admitted in 1990 had been released within 16 months after serving an average of 8 months of their sentence

o 47 percent of those admitted in 1990 and released on parole were convicted of trafficking 28 to 199 grams of cocaine and 10.6 percent were convicted of trafficking 400 grams or more of cocaine

o The average sentence of those admitted in 1990 and released on parole was 5.8 years and the sentence range was two years to 35 years

o Of those admitted in 1989 and were released on parole over 82 percent were convicted of trafficking 28 to 199 grams of cocaine, 6.1 percent were convicted of trafficking 200 to 399 grams and 7.2 percent were convicted of trafficking 400 or more grams of cocaine

o The average sentence of those admitted in 1989 and released on parole was 7.1 years

o Drug traffickers had been imprisoned an average of .3 times prior to their trafficking conviction

o Almost 80 percent had never been imprisoned prior to prison admission for trafficking

o   Traffickers had an average of 2.6 arrests including the trafficking arrest

o   Almost 49 percent had no arrest records prior to trafficking arrest

o   The average sentence for all traffickers admitted in 1989 and 1990 was 10.8 years

o   Over 92 percent of drug traffickers were convicted of trafficking cocaine

o   57 percent of offenders trafficked 28 to 199 grams of cocaine

o   8.9 percent of offenders trafficked 200 to 399 grams of cocaine

o   11.6 percent of offenders trafficked 400 or more grams of cocaine

o   Almost 15 percent of offenders trafficked an unspecified amount of cocaine

o   Slightly more than 2 percent of the traffickers were convicted of trafficking heroin

o   The average IQ for all traffickers was 91.4

o   61 percent of traffickers stated that they spent their formative years (youth) in an urban area

o   More than 64 percent stated that they grew up in poverty or subsistence status

o   Almost 71 percent were in poverty or subsistence status when arrested and almost 70 percent stated that they currently lived in urban areas

o   29 traffickers or 3.6 percent of all traffickers listed their place of birth as "other countries" and almost half of these indicated their current residence was New York or Florida

o   More than 46 percent were married at time of admission and 28 percent were single

o   The average education was reported to be 11th grade and the average score on the wide range activities test was 7.45

o   63.7 percent reported that they spent their youth with both parents while 26 percent said they grew up with only their mother

o   35 percent of drug traffickers reported that they never use drugs while 33 percent said they occasionally use drugs and 31.5 percent frequently use drugs

o   More than 28 percent were judged to have a minimal drug problem, 42.5 percent a moderate drug problem and 29 percent a severe drug problem

3

o Over 68 percent said they had a stable work record
o Almost 73 percent of drug traffickers said that no one in their family had a record of criminal behavior, 14 percent said they had felons in their family, 7.8 percent said they had misdemeanants in their family and 5.6 percent said they had both felons and misdemeanants in their family
o Almost 26 percent had a record of aliases in their criminal history.

In the analysis, offenders were sentenced by the types of prior arrests they had accumulated. Arrests were selected as the appropriate variable rather than convictions because conviction data appeared to be influenced by arrests prior to disposition and by missing data. Additionally, criminological literature supports the use of arrests as a useful variable in predicting criminal behavior.

Since few offenders specialized exclusively in a particular type of crime, some offenders appeared in two or three categories. The following categories of offenders, though not entirely exclusive, represent groups significantly different from the average characteristics of drug traffickers.

DRUG TRAFFICKERS WITH PRIOR ARRESTS FOR VIOLENT CRIMES

o 104 drug traffickers had prior arrests for homicide, rape, robbery or aggravated assault
o The average age for those with prior arrests for violent crimes was 35.9
o 58 percent were Black and 37.5 percent were White
o 94.2 percent were males

o Traffickers with prior arrests for violent crimes had an average of 1.1 prior imprisonments and an average of 6.1 total arrests
o These offenders received an average sentence of 12.75 years for the trafficking conviction
o More violent offenders than expected trafficked large quantities of cocaine (14.4 percent) and heroin (3.8 percent)
o The average IQ for the group was 90
o 70.8 percent reported their family's status as poverty or substantive and only 29 percent grew up in middle income homes
o 73.9 percent were in poverty or subsistence status at time of

arrest and only 22.9 percent were in middle income status

o More than 37 percent were married and 36.5 percent were single
o The average education for traffickers with prior arrests for violent crimes was 10.4 and the average Wide Range Achievement Test score was 6.7
o 61 percent were raised by both parents
o 32.6 percent reported that they never use drugs, 33.7 percent said they occasionally use drugs and 33.7 percent said they frequently use drugs
o Of those traffickers with a prior arrest for a violent crime and who used drugs, 19.5 percent were judged to have minimal problems, 51.9 percent had moderate problems and 28.6 percent had severe problems
o Slightly more than 67 percent said they had a stable work record
o 14.6 percent of these offenders had been released by July, 1991 and for those released, they spent an average of 17 months in prison
o Almost 52 percent had aliases listed in their criminal histories

DRUG TRAFFICKERS WITH PRIOR ARRESTS FOR DRUG OFFENSES

o 271 drug traffickers had prior arrests for drug related offenses
o The average age for those with prior arrests for drug offenses was 34.4
o 50 percent were Black and 43.5 percent were White
o 91.9 percent were males
o Traffickers with prior arrests for drug offenses had an average of .5 prior imprisonments and an average of 4.1 total arrests
o These offenders received an average sentence of 11.4 years for the trafficking conviction
o The average IQ for the group was 91.4
o 65.8 percent reported their family's status as poverty or substantive and only 33.7 percent grew up in middle income homes
o 69.6 percent were in poverty or subsistence status at time of arrest
o 30.4 percent were married and 43 percent were single
o The average education for prior drug offenders was 11.1 and the average Wide Range Achievement Test score was 7.2
o 64 percent were raised by both parents

o 28.7 percent reported that they never use drugs, 34.8 percent said they occasionally use drugs and 36.4 percent said they frequently use drugs

o Of those traffickers with a prior arrest for a drug offense and who used drugs, 20.6 percent were judged to have minimal problems, 43.1 percent had moderate problems and 35.8 percent had severe problems

o Slightly more than 69.3 percent said they had a stable work record

o 20.7 percent of these offenders had been released by July, 1991 and for those released, they spent an average of 12.6 months in prison

o More than 40 percent had aliases listed in their criminal histories

DRUG TRAFFICKERS WITH PRIOR ARRESTS FOR PROPERTY CRIMES

o 179 drug traffickers had prior arrests for property crimes

o The average age for those with prior arrests for property crimes was 34.9

o 48.6 percent were Black and 45 percent were White

o 92.2 percent were males

o Traffickers with prior arrests for violent crimes had an average of .9 prior imprisonments and an average of 5.3 total arrests

o These offenders received an average sentence of 10.56 years for the trafficking conviction

o The average IQ for the group was 92.3

o 62.4 percent reported their family's status as poverty or substantive and almost 37 percent grew up in middle income homes

o 70.2 percent were in poverty or subsistence status at time of arrest and almost 27 percent were in middle income status

o Almost 32 percent were married and 38.5 percent were single

o The average education for traffickers with prior arrests for property crimes was 10.7 and the average Wide Range Achievement Test score was 7.1

o 64 percent were raised by both parents

o 23.9 percent reported that they never use drugs, 32.5 percent said they occasionally use drugs and 43.6 percent said they frequently use drugs

o Of those traffickers with a prior arrest for property crimes and
   who used drugs, 17.4 percent were judged to have minimal
   problems, 43.8 percent had moderate problems and 38.9 percent
   had severe problems
o Slightly more than 69 percent said they had a stable work record
o 22.3 percent of these offenders had been released by July, 1991
   and for those released, they spent an average of 14.4 months in
   prison
o 42.6 percent had aliases listed in their criminal histories

DRUG TRAFFICKERS WITH NO PRIOR ARRESTS

o 388 drug traffickers had no prior arrests
o The average age for those with no prior arrests was 33.1
o 52 percent were Black and 38 percent were White
o 87.1 percent were males
o These offenders received an average sentence of 10.5 years for
   the trafficking conviction
o The average IQ for the group was 91.4
o 64.3 percent reported their family's status as poverty or
   substantive and 33.7 percent grew up in middle income homes
o 72.4 percent were in poverty or subsistence status at time of
   arrest and only 25.6 percent were in middle income status
o More than 27 percent were married and 48 percent were single
o The average education for traffickers with no prior arrests was
   11.2 and the average Wide Range Achievement Test score was 7.8
o 64 percent were raised by both parents
o 40.3 percent reported that they never use drugs, 34.1 percent said
   they occasionally use drugs and 25.6 percent said they frequently
   use drugs
o Of those traffickers with no prior arrests and who used drugs,
   36.1 percent were judged to have minimal problems, 41.1 percent
   had moderate problems and 22.6 percent had severe problems
o Slightly more than 69 percent said they had a stable work record
o 34.3 percent of these offenders had been released by July, 1991
   and for those released, they spent an average of 13.8 months in
   prison
o Slightly more than 13.2 percent had aliases listed in their
   criminal histories

CHARACTERISTICS OF

DRUG TRAFFICKERS ADMITTED

TO THE NORTH CAROLINA

DEPARTMENT of CORRECTION

1989 and 1990

Report on the Research

There can be no doubt that "drug trafficking and abuse wreak enormous damage on society each year" (Graham, 1987). The problem is growing worse. In January, 1985 a Gallop Poll reported that only two percent of Americans described drug abuse as the most important problem facing our country. By May, 1989, 27 percent of Americans listed drug abuse as society's most serious problem. Similarly, a 1987 Gallop Poll showed that 54 percent of youth felt that drug abuse was one of the biggest problems facing people their age (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1990).

The response to the problem of drug abuse has been expansive. An Anti-Drug Abuse Act was passed in 1988 followed by the President's National Drug Control Strategy in 1989. The emphasis on drugs and crime along with increases in drug use have resulted in dramatic pressures on law enforcement. "More than 70 percent of both police and sheriffs say their workloads are heavier because they are now making more arrests for drug offenses" (Manili and Conner, 1988). Training in programs to reduce drug problems in their communities have been the topics selected most often by law enforcement (Manili and Conners, 1988).

The chief of law enforcement officer in this country, the United States Attorney General, said in an open letter to the President that "drug trafficking is the number one crime problem facing our country and the world. Drug trafficking enterprises have infiltrated villages and town in our heartland" (Thornburgh, 1989). Yet with the incredible toll of drug

abuse on our society and the centrality of trafficking to that problem, there is surprisingly little research on the characteristics of drug traffickers.

During "the 1970s and 1980s the DEA developed a profile of the typical drug smuggler, a profile that was so vague and generalized that the net it cast was challenged vigorously by civil libertarians" (Zonderman, 1990). These characteristics were intended to assist law enforcement agents in identifying drug couriers who were using commercial airlines to transport drugs or money for the purchase of drugs. Among the characteristics included in the profile were:

o Youth

o Luggage without identification tags, empty luggage or
   lack of luggage

o Making a phone call after deplaning

o Unusual nervousness

o Use of public transportation

o Last-minute arrival or deplaning last

o Paying cash for an airline ticket

o Appearance of Hispanic origin

o Purchase of a one-way ticket

o Arrival from a known drug import center (Zonderman, 1990).

Even though these characteristics have a strong possibility of falsely identifying innocent persons, the courts ruled in 1989 in the case United

States v. Sokolow that the drug courier profile served as reasonable suspicion to detail and search a person.

There is a surprising void in the research on the characteristics of drug traffickers. Reuter and Haaga (1989) interviewed forty "high-level dealers" who were incarcerated in the least secure federal institutions within the Bureau of Persons. The focus of that study was not to analyze the characteristics of the traffickers but to study the organization of drug markets and identify enforcement strategies. In another project, Bayer (1989) described the psychological and behavioral traits of entrepreneurs and then related those traits to criminal entrepreneurs, especially drug traffickers. The project was sponsored by the Police Executive Research Forum and provides us with a dimension of criminal behavior which, ostensibly, should fit the characteristics of drug traffickers. Bayer draws the conclusion that criminal entrepreneurs are similar to their non-criminal counterparts. Criminal entrepreneurs:

o tend to exhibit an internal, not external, locus of control,

o believe that they have the ability to control their own destiny,

o will take huge risks if the rewards are great

o are generally dissatisfied and discontented

o have personal lives that are isolated and lonely

o have difficulty maintaining stable relationships

These are psychological traits which may describe some drug traffickers but, like other profiles, they lack a great deal of specificity.

This research project focuses on the characteristics of drug traffickers apprehended in North Carolina and currently incarcerated in the state. The technique used will be similar to the "profiling" used in identifying potential airline hijackers.

TRENDS, PATTERNS and PROFILES:

The use of "profiling" has been mentioned briefly but the basis of analysis deserves greater attention. Profiling is most often associated with "psychological profiling" and is used to match a specific individual, still at large, with traits consistent with the evidence found at the scene or the selection of victims. Psychological profiling is used most often in cases of murder and sexual assaults (Swanson, Chamelin, and Territo, 1988; Bennett and Hess, 1987; Gilbert, 1986). Profiling in the general sense has been applied to the crimes of bombing, skyjacking and drug importing (Zonderman, 1990).

The type of analysis to be used in this study is more consistent with "crime analysis" than with "psychological profiling." Crime analysis, sometimes called "crime trend analysis" (Estrella, 1989), "quantitative analysis" (Masuda, 1989), or simply "crime analysis" (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1977) is the development of patterns and trends in the commission of crimes based on the analysis of offense characteristics and offender characteristics. The major shortcoming in the use of crime analysis to establish trends and patterns of drug trafficking is that law enforcement knows of only those cases where an

12

offender was arrested. Drug trafficking which is undetected cannot be analyzed so the analysts will have only part of the information needed to establish trends and patterns. As it used in this study, crime analysis is the basis for identifying categories of offenders by the patterns and trends in their background, demographic characteristics, social history and criminal history. One similar effort to categorize drug offenders was titled Characteristics of Different Types of Drug-Involved Offenders, (National Institute of Justice, 1988). That typology was a compilation of the literature on drug use and drug dealing. The authors examined "types of drug users and offenders in the adolescent population, then their adult counterparts" (National Institute of Justice, 1988:1). The tables describing the authors' typologies are included in Attachment I.

Though the National Institute of Justice bulletin considers drug use and crime record in a general way for each "type" of offender, the "characteristics" are of little use to law enforcers or policy makers. The categories are too vague to be of any benefit. Top-level dealers, for example, are described as having "None to heavy use of multiple types of drugs" (1988:6).

A more ambitious and useful approach is that of the National Institute of Justice and its Drug Use Forecasting reports. This research screens drug use among arrestees in 22 cities and has been replicated in other states and cities. In each site, 225 males and approximately 100 females are sampled, interviewed and asked to provide voluntary and

anonymous urine specimens. More than 90 percent of the arrestees agreed to be interviewed and 72 percent of the arrestees agreed to provide specimens (National Institute of Justice, 1990).

The Drug Use Forecasting research shows the remarkable difference in drug use at the various sites. The percentage of males who tested positive for a drug at the time of arrest varied from 53 percent in San Antonio to 82 percent in San Diego (National Institute of Justice, 1990: 2). Age groups and racial categories also varied by city. The most frequent charges for which male drug users were arrested were drug sale/possession (83 percent tested positive), burglary (75 percent tested positive) and robbery (73 percent positive). Female drug users were most often arrested for drug sale/possession (83 percent positive), prostitution (82 percent positive), robbery (75 percent positive) followed closely by stolen vehicle (73 percent tested positive) (National Institute of Justice, 1990: 9). This research points out the high percentages of property offenders who use drugs as well as the number of violent offenders using drugs. The data do not provide a separate set of characteristics for drug traffickers.

One publication of research, drawn from the intelligence files of U. S. Attorneys and based on successful prosecutions conducted in their districts, is focused on <u>Drug Trafficking</u> (Office of the Attorney General, 1989). This publication, however, provides only two pieces of information, neither of of which is very useful to policy makers and law

enforcers. The publication lists the principal drugs of abuse and the principal drug trafficking organizations. The organizations identified are:

- o Columbian Drug Cartels

- o La Cosa Nostra and the Sicilian Mafia

- o Asian Organized Crime Groups

- o Jamaican Posses

- o Outlaw Motorcycle Gangs

- o California Street Gangs

- o Other Domestic Trafficking Organizations

    "Dixie Mafia"

    "Miami Boys"

    Young Professionals or "Yuppies"

- o Other Foreign Nationals

These categories provide information for national policy makers and those tracking the importation and distribution of drugs but are not specific enough to be useful at the state level. The examples given are not necessarily representative:

> The profile of the highest-level cocaine dealer in Columbus, Ohio, is that of a middle-aged white residing in one of the city's more affluent suburbs. Cocaine trafficking groups in Colorado are composed primarily of upper middle-class individuals of Caucasian or Hispanic background (Office of the Attorney General, 1989: 37)

Obviously this "profile" fits far more non-traffickers than traffickers.

There is evidence that youth gang members such as those referred to as "California Street Gangs" in the Attorney General's publication (1989: 33) contribute an inordinate amount of drug trafficking. This involvement in the distribution of "hard" drugs is based on the economic opportunities and conducted most often by "entrepreneurian gangs" (Fagan, 1989: 636). Still, there is no specific information on the characteristics of drug traffickers. This topic represents a void in the research yet drug trafficking is central to the most serious problem we face in our society—drug abuse.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This project, sponsored by the North Carolina Governor's Crime Commission and the Department of Crime Control and Public Safety, sought to assess and analyze the characteristics of a subset of drug traffickers in North Carolina. The group selected for analysis was all persons convicted and sentenced for drug trafficking in North Carolina in 1989 and 1990. This represented the most recent group of traffickers for which data could be gathered. The Department of Correction agreed to provide demographic information, social history, work history and substance abuse information on each of the 802 drug traffickers admitted to correctional facilities from January 1, 1989 through December 31, 1990. Much of these data were collected from inmates at admission to the Department of Correction and are "self-reported." The code sheet

used was the "Demographic and Background Data Code Sheet" (Attachment 2). Additionally, data on the results of the Wide Range Achievement Test, yielding a grade-level equivalent of the individual's achievement, and the Revised Beta Examination, giving an IQ-equivalent, were provided. The offender's drug use was provided in self-report form but "drug problem magnitude" was assessed independently by Department of Corrections personnel. The corrections data also included the type of drug and quantity for which the inmate was convicted of trafficking. These case files represent the most comprehensive documentation of the characteristics of drug traffickers available in North Carolina.

"Drug Trafficking" in North Carolina is defined by statute. The General Statutes of North Carolina (1990), Volume 12, Chapter 90, Section 95 describes a trafficker as one who sells, manufactures, delivers, transports or possesses:

o In excess of 50 pounds of marijuana

o 1000 or more capsules, tables or dosage units of methaqualone

o 28 or more grams of cocaine

o 1000 or more capsules, tables or dosage units of amphetamine

o 28 or more grams of methamphetamine

o Four or more grams of opium or opiate

o 100 or more tablets, capsules or dosage units of Lysergic Acid Diethylamide

There are additional penalties for gradated amounts of each named drug

over those listed as a minimum for the charge of trafficking.

A second data set on the same 802 drug traffickers was provided by the State Bureau of Investigation. The criminal history of each drug trafficker identified by the Department of correction was printed, coded and entered along with the data from the Department of Correction. The resulting merged data set represented the demographics, social, work, substance abuse and criminal histories of these 802 drug traffickers.

Analyses conducted on these data included descriptive and higher level statistics as well as the termination of patterns.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

DEMOGRAPHICS AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUG TRAFFICKERS

The drug traffickers in this research had an average age of 33.6 years. Almost 40 percent were white and 52 percent black with the remaining eight percent in other racial groups. More than 89 percent were males and 10.7 percent were females. The average educational level reported by the traffickers was eleventh grade and the grouped distribution for education is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Educational Distribution of Drug Traffickers

Educational Level	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 6th Grade	15	1.9
6th through 9th Grade	166	20.7
10th through 11th Grade	213	26.6
High School Graduate	261	32.5
Some College	111	13.8
College Graduate	28	3.5
Graduate School	8	1.0
Total	802	100.0

Almost 58 percent of the traffickers were born in North Carolina. The most frequent place of birth outside North Carolina was New York where 10.2 percent of the traffickers were born. The next most frequent state of birth was Florida (4.0 percent). Almost four percent of the drug traffickers were born in countries other than the United States.

19

The majority of drug traffickers reported that they lived with their parents in their formative years. Table 2 shows the family status of the traffickers in their formative years.

Table 2

Family Status During Formative Years

With Whom Offender Lived	Frequency	Percentage
Lived with both parents	465	58.0
Lived with Mother only	189	23.6
Lived with Father only	14	1.7
Lived with other relatives	55	6.9
Lived with foster parents	7	.9
Lived in an institution	1	.1
Not Reported	71	8.9
Total	802	100.0

The traffickers reported that they had an average of two brothers and two sisters. More than 72 percent of the traffickers stated that there were no felons or misdemeanants in their family while 14 percent said there were felons in their immediate family.

Almost 30 percent said they had no children and 26.1 percent said they had one child. Some, however, had parented a child out of wedlock because 46 percent reported their marital status as single, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Marital Status of Drug Traffickers

Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	369	46.0
Married	228	28.4
Separated	74	9.2
Divorced	124	15.5
Widowed	7	.9
Total	802	100.0

More than 61 percent said they spent their formative years in an urban environment and 38.9 percent said they grew up in a rural area. At the time of their arrest, 69.5 percent said they lived in urban areas and 30.5 percent said they lived in rural areas.

The economic status of the trafficker's family during his or her formative years was listed as poverty or subsistence in 64.7 percent of the cases while 34.1 percent said they grew up in a middle income home and 1.2 percent said their family was upper income. When they were arrested the economic status of 70.9 percent of the traffickers was poverty or subsistence, 27.7 percent were middle income and 2.5 percent said they were upper income.

The average IQ for the drug traffickers was 91.5. The average score on the Wide Range Achievement Test was 7.48 which means that their achievement level was slightly more than halfway through the seventh grade. Although the achievement level is low, the IQ score is within the

range for "normal" IQ.

Over 68 percent reported that their work history was "stable" and 28 percent said it was "unstable." The remaining 3.7 percent said they had no work history. The most frequently selected occupational classification was semi-skilled (40.2 percent) followed by 24.8 percent who said they were skilled workers and 22.2 percent who said they were unskilled.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE HISTORY

Offenders were asked to report their drug and alcohol histories as a part of the admissions process in prison. Since these questions require the self-reporting of substance abuse, they may be suspect, however, the corrections personnel were instructed to tell the offender that the responses would simply be used to assist in treatment decisions and would not effect their status or prison record. More than 35 percent said they never use drugs, 33.2 percent said they occasionally use drugs and 31.5 percent said they frequently use drugs. Alcohol use was more prevalent but less severe. Twenty-three percent said they never use alcohol, 58 percent said they occasionally use alcohol and 18.5 percent said they frequently use alcohol.

Of those who said they use drugs, 29.8 percent said they use cocaine, 19.9 percent said they use marijuana and 48.4 percent said they use combinations of drugs.

Of the 72 percent for whom data were available, the corrections

personnel indicated minimal substance abuse magnitude for 28.4 percent, moderate for 42.5 percent and severe for.29 percent. Over 14 percent said they were using drugs at the time of their trafficking offense, four percent said they were using alcohol and 7.4 percent said they were using both. The remaining 74.4 percent said they were sober.

CRIMINAL HISTORIES

More than 79 percent (79.5 percent) had not been imprisoned prior to the drug trafficking admission. More than 51 percent of the drug traffickers had never been arrested before the drug trafficking charge and 18.5 percent had a record of one previous arrest. The range of total arrests for the drug traffickers is shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Total Number of Arrests for Drug Traffickers

Number of Arrests on Record*	Frequency	Percentage
1	388	48.7
2	147	18.5
3	98	12.3
4	52	6.5
5	31	3.9
6	24	3.0
7	12	1.5
8	14	1.8
9	6	.8
10	9	1.1
More than 10	21	2.9
Total	802	100.0

*Including Arrest for Drug Trafficking

The average year of first prior arrest for the drug traffickers was 1981, grouped as shown in Table 5.

Table 5
Year of First Prior Arrest

Year Group	Frequency	Percentage
1960 or earlier	11	1.4
1961 to 1966	9	1.1
1966 to 1971	14	1.7
1971 to 1976	36	4.5
1976 to 1981	66	8.2
1981 to 1986	86	10.7
1986 to 1991	175	21.8
No Prior or Missing Data	405	50.5
Total	802	100.0

The average sentence which these offenders received for the drug trafficking charge was 10.8 years and the range of sentences was one year to 52 years. Of those admitted to the Department of Correction in 1989 on drug trafficking convictions, 42 percent were released on parole by July, 1991 after serving an average of 15 months of their sentence. Almost 15 percent of the drug traffickers admitted in 1990 had been released by July, 1991 after serving 8 months of their sentence.

The specific conviction for drug trafficking for the 802 offenders is shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6

Drug Trafficking Conviction

Offense	Frequency	Percentage
Schedule I Trafficking	32	4.0
Schedule II Trafficking	117	14.6
Schedule IV Trafficking	3	.4
Heroin, more than 28 grams	4	.5
Heroin, 14 to 27 grams	2	.2
Heroin, 4 to 13 grams	11	1.4
Marijuana, more than 10000 lbs.	3	.4
Marijuana, 100 to 1999 lbs.	2	.2
Marijuana, 50 to 99 lbs.	3	.4
Methamphetamine, 5000 to 9999	1	.1
Meth., 1000 to 4999 doses	3	.4
Cocaine, more than 400 grams	93	11.6
Cocaine, 200 or 399 grams	71	8.9
Cocaine, 28 to 199 grams	457	57.0
Total	802	100.0

This general information is useful to policy makers and law enforcement officials because:

o better information yields better decision-making in the Criminal Justice System and better policies,

o drug trafficking represents a serious problem in our society,

o we have valuable information at our disposal which we are not using, and

o it is critical to gather information on the correlates of crime.

One of the most important questions regarding these data is "How do drug traffickers differ from other offenders?" While that was not one of the research issues, it is important to present some comparative information.

The average age of drug traffickers in the study was 33.6 years but the average for all offenders admitted to Department of Correction during the same period was 29 years of age. Drug traffickers are significantly older than new offenders.

There were more females in the drug trafficking group than expected. Less than nine percent of all admissions are women yet females represent eleven percent of the drug traffickers.

The racial composition of drug traffickers represented an interesting variable. The average racial composition for the Department of Correction's inmates is 60 percent black and 36 percent white. The drug traffickers were 52.2 percent black and 36.87 percent white. More whites and other non-blacks were engaged in trafficking than the prison population would lead us to believe.

Far more drug traffickers were from Mecklenburg county than expected. While only nine percent of the prisoners are from Mecklenburg county, almost 14 percent of the traffickers listed that as their residence. Almost all (104 of 110) who were from Mecklenburg county were arrested in Charlotte.

The drug traffickers represented a predominantly poor group. Seventy-one percent were in poverty or subsistence status at the time of

arrest. These traffickers are, however, significantly higher on the economic scale than other offenders. Over 80 percent of the 1990 Department of Correction population were in poverty or substance status at the time of arrest.

Consistent with the literature on entrepreneurs being "loners," 46 percent of drug traffickers were single while only 16 percent of felons admitted to the Department of Correction were single.

Finally, the drug traffickers were far less likely to be known by the Criminal Justice System than other offenders. Only 20.5 percent of the drug traffickers had a record of prior imprisonments but 48.9 percent of Department of Correction admissions had prior imprisonments.

GENERAL PROFILE

The general profile of Drug Traffickers admitted to the Department of Correction in 1989 and 1990 is as follows:

o Older than the average offender,

o In early to mid-30's,

o More often single than other offenders,

o Overwhelmingly male (89 percent) but more females than expected compared to the general population,

o Predominantly black but still a significant number are white and more non-white and non-black than expected,

o Predominantly poor, urban residents,

o With weak educational achievement,

o Of low average intelligence,

o Almost one-third use drugs frequently and have a severe drug problem,

o With about one-fourth having a record of aliases,

o Far more likely to be trafficking cocaine than other drugs.

While this information is useful, more specificity can be gained by categorizing offenders based on prior behavior. Through the criminal histories of the 802 offenders, it was possible to categorize them as violent offenders, property offenders, prior drug offenders and traffickers with no prior arrests. Each of these categories will be explored below.

DRUG TRAFFICKERS WITH NO PRIOR ARRESTS

Drug traffickers with no prior arrests represented the largest of the four categories. Almost half (388) of the 802 drug traffickers had no prior arrests. These were the youngest of the drug traffickers with an average age of 33.1 years.

This category had a smaller percentage who trafficked drugs other than cocaine but a higher percentage of those who trafficked 200 to 399 grams of cocaine. By far, the highest percentage of drug traffickers who never use drugs and who have the least severe drug problem were in this category.

Of those with no prior arrest, 12.9 percent were female. Additionally, these offenders had the highest levels of educational achievement and the highest percentage of urban residents of any of the

groups. Table 7 shows the profile of these offenders.

Table 7

Profile of Traffickers With No Prior Arrests
(N = 388)

Average Age 33.1 years
52% Black   38% White
Average sentence for trafficking 10.5 years
91.2% trafficked cocaine
Average IQ 91.4
71% lived in urban area at time of arrest
72.4% were in poverty or subsistence status
47.9% were single, 27.3% married
40.3% never use drugs
34.1% occasionally use drugs
25.6% frequently use drugs
22.6% of those who use drugs have a severe drug abuse problem

---

TRAFFICKERS WITH PRIOR ARRESTS FOR DRUG OFFENSES

The next largest category of drug traffickers was that of offenders with prior arrests for drug offenses. This category represented 271 offenders or 34 percent of the total. They had an average of 4.1 arrests per person and half of these offenders had been imprisoned previously.

The average age of these traffickers was 34.4 years. More than 43 percent were white and 50 percent were black. Almost 30 percent of the traffickers were living in rural areas at time of arrest and 70.4 percent lived in urban areas. Almost 69 percent lived in poverty or substance

status. Forty-three percent were single and 30.4 percent were married.

The average IQ of these traffickers was 91.4 and the Wide Range

Achievement Test score was 7.8. Almost 29 percent said they never use

drugs while 36.4 percent said they use drugs frequently, and 35.8 of those

who use drugs had a severe drug problem.

The profile for drug traffickers with prior arrests for a drug offense

was:

Table 8

Profile of Traffickers with Prior Drug Arrests
(N = 271)

Average age 34.4 years
50% Black 43.5 White
.5 Prior imprisonments
4.1 Total Arrests Per offender
Average sentence was 11.4 years
Average IQ 91.4
62% from urban areas
29% Never use drugs
36% Reported frequent use of drugs
36% of those who use drugs had a severe drug abuse problem

A correlation Matrix* shows that total arrests vary inversely (R = -.68)

with education for these offenders. It also shows that sentence and race

vary directly which means that blacks receive different sentences than

*Correlation Coefficients are represented by R, significance is two-

tailed.

whites.

Predictably, education varied directly with the family's economic status (R = .254). It appears that the traffickers sentenced in 1990 had a significantly higher IQ than those sentenced in 1989. A very strong relationship was present between the number of imprisonments and the year of first arrest (R = -.513).

TRAFFICKERS WITH PRIOR ARRESTS FOR PROPERTY OFFENSES

Drug traffickers with prior arrests for property offenses number 179 and their characteristics were remarkably different. Their average age was 34.9 years, older than the previous categories. This group had a much higher percentage of whites (45 percent) and a lower percentage of blacks (48.6 percent). They had an average of 5.3 arrests and .9 imprisonments, on the average.

Property offenders had the highest percentage trafficking the smaller amounts of cocaine (59 percent) and the smallest percentage who trafficked the largest amounts (8 percent).

The average IQ of these traffickers was 92.3, yet the Wide Range Achievement Test scores were lower than those of the two previous categories. Far fewer property offenders came from families in poverty and subsistence status but, by the time of arrest, they were equal to the other categories in the lower status.

Almost 32 percent of these traffickers were married and 38.5

percent were single. Their average sentence of 10.6 years was among the lowest of the categories.

Traffickers with prior property arrests represented the smallest percentage (23.9 percent) of those who said they never use drugs. They represented the highest frequency of heavy drug use (43.6 percent) and the highest percentage of traffickers who had sevre drug abuse problems (38.9 percent). The profile of offenders in this category is shown below:

Table 9

Traffickers With Prior Arrests For Property Offense

Average age 34.9 years
.9 Prior imprisonments
48.6% Black 45% White
5.3 Total arrests per offender
Average sentence 10.6 years
Average IQ 92.25
70.2% Were in property or subsistence status
23.9% Never use drugs
43.6% Reported frequent use of drugs
39% of those who use drugs had severe drug abuse problems

The year of first arrest for these traffickers was, on the average, 1978 and they averaged one arrest each 2.3 years. As expected, the total number of arrests was highly correlated with the year of first arrest (R = -.437). Interestingly, the total number of arrests was also correlated with the Wide Range Achievement Test scores (R = -.19, significance =

.015). Drug use is directly related to IQ (R = .198, significance = .012) which means that as IQ increases among the traffickers, so does drug use.

The family's socioeconomic status had a significant effect on the offender's education (R = .2316, significance .003) and on IQ (R = .1852, significnce = .019) as well as the family's criminal experiences (R = -.196, significance = .012).

The race of the offender was positively correlated with months in prison (R = .301, significance = .05) meaning that blacks served longer sentences before being released on parole. Race was also correlated with the offender's alcohol use (R = -.176, significance = .024) but this shows that whites have more severe alcohol abuse problems.

TRAFFICKERS WITH PRIOR ARRESTS FOR VIOLENT OFFENSES

This category represents the most interesting and troublesome of the traffickers. The traffickers with prior violent offense arre3sts numbered 104. These offenders averaged 35.9 years of age so they were the oldest offenders. They had the highest percentage of blacks (58 percent) and only 37.5 percent whites.

These offenders averaged 6.1 total arrests and 1.1 imprisonments. These offenders began their criminal career earlier than the others. The average year of first arrest was 1976 making the trafficker approximately 21 at age of first arrest.

The violent traffickers received sentences averaging 12.75 years.

Their trafficking offenses were the most serious of the categories. A higher percentage of violent traffickers were convicted of trafficking heroin as well as 400 or more grams of cocaine.

The average IQ of this group was 90 and the Wide Range Achievement Test scores were the lowest (6.7) among all groups. The educational level attained was also the lowest (10.4 years).

These offenders had relatively low levels of drug use. About one-third reported that they never use drugs, one-third reported a moderately use of drugs and one-third frequently use drugs. More than one-half had aliases listed in their criminal histories.

The profile for these offenders is depicted below:

TABLE 10

Traffickers With Prior Arrests For Violent Crimes

Average age 35.9 years
58% Black   37.5% White
1.1 Prior imprisonments
6.1 Total arrests per offender
Average sentence 12.75 years
Average IQ 90
32.6 Percent never use drugs
34 Percent reported frequent use of drugs
29 Percent of those who use drugs, had severe drug abuse problems

---

Traffickers with violent arrests seem to be the most homogeneous of the groups. Their drug use history seems to be a recent development.

The correlation between drug use and year of first arrest is strong (R =
.345, significance = .001) but direct. The greater the drug use, the more
likely it is that the first arrest was recent. Other significant
correlations are:

TABLE 11

Correlations of Characteristics of Violent Traffickers

Variables	R	Significance
Abuse Magnitude with IQ	.199	.085
Abuse Magnitude with Drug Use	.48	.000
Abuse Magnitude with Economic Level	-.2726	.016
Abuse Magnitude with Religion	.197	.086
Drug Use with IQ	.186	.076
Drug Use with Race	-.272	.008
Drug Use with Age	-.396	.000
Alcohol Use with Imprisonments	.2101	.047

The criminological implications of these relationships are complex and
will be explored more completely in further research.

COMPARISON OF CATEGORIES

Although the discussion of the categories has been detailed, it has
not provided an opportunity to observe the patterns and profiles in a
comparative table. Table 12 presents the profiles together:

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS

	VIOLENT	DRUG	PROPERTY	NO PRIOR
Age	35.9%	34.4%	34.9%	33.1%
Race: Black	58%	50%	48.6%	52%
Prior Imprisonments	35.9%	34.4%	34.9%	33.1%
Total Arrests	6.1	4.1	5.3	0
Year First Arrested	1976	1982	1978	0
Family Poverty/Sub	70.8%	65.8%	63.4%	64.3%
Current Poverty	26%	24.3%	22.4%	19.9%
Current Subsistence	47.7%	45.3%	47.8%	52.5%
Married	37.5%	30.4%	31.8%	27.3%
Education (Grade)	10.4	11.1	10.7	11.2
WRAT (Grade Level)	6.7	7.2	7.1	7.8
IQ Score	90	91.4	92.3	91.4
Never Use Drugs	32.6%	28.7%	23.9%	40.3%
Released on Parole	14.6%	20.7%	22.3%	34.3%
Aliases	51.9%	40.1%	42.6%	13.2%
Number	104	271	179	388

It is evident that violent offensers are the oldest, most "residual" offenders with 6.1 arrests, 1.1 prior imprisonments and the earliest age of first arrest. They are also the least educated, have the lowest achievement scores and are the poorest. Interestingly, they are also the ones most likely to be married.

Property offenders are those most likely to have drug problems. It appears that their criminality is designed to support their substance abuse. Their IQ scores are the highest but their education level is low.

Prior drug offenders are those with no prior arrests and who, to a

greater degree, meet the characteristics of entrepreneurs or "innovators" whose means to succeed include deviant behavior. They come from the fewest poverty/subsistence households, are the youngest and the least attached (not married).

These comparisons have policy implications which apply to police, courts and corrections—every major component of the criminal justice system.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Traffickers with no prior arrests come closest to the "hustlers" referred to in the literature (Mieczkowski, 1986). These traffickers are young and tend not to use drugs with great frequency. They also fit the profile of entrepreneurs as discussed earlier. They are "loners" who seek to excel in an innovative way (drug trafficking) rather than conventional ways. Entreprenurism implies a level of intelligence not evident in the traffickers with no prior arrests or those with prior arrests. A more applicable label is that of "innovator."

While causes and effects are difficult conclusions to draw, the correlations of variables help guide criminal justice and other agencies' decisions. Variables which are important in explaining drug use and crime selection among those without prior arrests and those with prior drug arrests are:

o   Race (higher drug use among white traffickers)

o   Father's alcohol use (R = .21)

37

o   IQ (R = .135) where the higher IQ's have higher levels of drug use

o   Type of drug trafficked was influenced by mother's drug use (R = -.17, significance = .012) where traffickers possessed drugs other than cocaine when their mother's drug use was high

o   Education, WRAT scores and IQ were related to the family's economic status and the offender's economic status

o   For prior drug offenders, the trafficker's drug use was influenced by their father's drug use (R = .20) and their father's alcohol use (R = .17)

o   The offender's alcohol use was a strong predictor of their drug use especially among those with no prior arrests (R = .42) but also among those with prior drug arrests (R = .34)

For these categories of offenders, special task forces to exercise "expressive law Enforcement" (Moore and Kleiman, 1989) to interrupt and harass the trafficking may be useful. Entrepreneurs are cognizant of the cost-benefit ratio and if the cost or risk outweighs the benefit, the behavior will be suppressed. Incapacitation need not be lengthy but should be certain for the deterrent effect to operate. An offender's alcohol use is a strong predictor of their drug use so, for those offenders who use drugs, there are probably alcohol-related violations or calls for service to forewarn law enforcement. Targeting these calls for service through crime analysis may lead to a stronger problem-identification.

The categories of offenders with no prior arrests or with drug-related arrests are younger than others and are significantly influenced by their father's alcohol use as well as their father's drug use. These may serve as factors considered by social service agencies in targeting "at risk" populations of youth.

Implications for police, courts, corrections and communities for these categories of traffickers include:

o   Certainty of punishment made harsh enough to harass "innovative" strategy of trafficker but not necessarily to incapacitate (they contribute relatively few offenses)

o   A shorter presumptive sentence but a mandatory time served before parole consideration and <u>no</u> parole consideration would accomplish this goal

o   Take advantage of the higher IQ scores and WRAT scores to re-orient the "innovativeness" of some of these offenders

o   Interrupt the father's substance abuse role-model through community programs

o   Increasing the inconvenience to drug buyers will harass traffickers and increase their potential to rechannel innovation into more legitimate directions.

o   Expressive enforcement strategies

o   Recognition that the absence of an arrest and conviction record does not justify a mild response from judicial or parole

decision-makers.

o   Certainty of punishment and consistent application are important.

o   Corrections needs to recognize the importance of the "innovation" or entrepreneurism of these categories of offenders and re-channel their abilities

o   Reintegration strategies should include role model redefinition and the development of legitimate relationships

Offenders with prior arrests for property offenses are the ones most prone to be abusers of drugs. Again, cause and effect is a dangerous trap but the correction of abuse magnitude and number of imprisonments is significant ($R = .20$) and the relationship between drug use and abuse magnitude is very strong ($R = .56$). As with other categories of offenders, whites reported a higher level of drug use than blacks. Family history, father's substance use and mother's substance use were not important factors in the individual's drug use. The offender's alcohol use was significant ($R = .28$) but not as strong as the two categories mentioned previously.

An interesting variable relationship, but one which cannot be explained without further investigation was the relationship between months imprisoned before parole and reported father's alcohol use ($R = -.46$). While this relationship was strong and significant, the father's alcohol use did not effectively explain any other variables.

The absence of other variables to explain drug use among these offenders, the highest drug users, implied that drug use is habitual and hedonistic. Also implied is that the trafficking is associated with drug use. The relationship between reported drug use and use of drugs at the time of offense (sober versus intoxicated) was very strong (R = .56). Property offenders may steal and traffic to support their habit.

The policy implicators include:

o   Drug screening for the property offenders may identify chronic offenders

o   Chronic property crime, accompanied by drug trafficking should subject offenders to more lengthy sentences and periods of incapacitation

o   Property crimes in drug infested areas should be targets of drug enforcement units because of the relationships shown in this research

o   Drug abuse rehabilitation at the community level and in corrections, may have a remarkable effect on property crime

o   Sentencing and incarceration may be indeterminate depending on the offender's responsiveness to treatment. This is consistent with the literature and would resolve many of the criticisms of selective incapacitation (Haapanen, 1990).

o   Drug screening of property offenders while on parole is critical.

Enforcement strategies for this category of offenders should be traditional but intensive since the total number of arrests is high (5.3 per offender) and the amount trafficked was relatively small in all categories, especially cocaine.

The final category, violent offenders convicted of trafficking, poses the greatest threat to society. These are the most prolific offenders (6.1 arrests) and the most often imprisoned (average of 1.1 prior imprisonments). The relationship between imprisonments and arrests is strong (R = .57) as well as total arrests with year of first arrest (R = .26).

For violent offenders, their election to traffic certain drugs and certain quantities was influenced significantly by their mother's drug use (R = .29). Those who began their criminal career more recently are much more likely to use drugs more frequently (R = .34) as are those who are younger (R = .40).

For violent offenders, drug use varies inversely with race (R = -.27) meaning whites are more likely to use drugs more frequently. Drug use of violent offenders does not seem to be explained by any other variables, nor does it seem to explain any other variables. The implication is that violence and criminality, including trafficking, are explained independent of their drug dependence.

The policy implications include:

o   Enforcement, prosecution and corrections should target violent traffickers using a system similar to "operation triggerlock."

These offenders are the most serious threats.

o   Courts and corrections should focus on incapacitation of violent offenders and certainly violent traffickers so that the chronic criminal career will be interrupted

o   Drug interdiction and drug enforcement strategies are secondary to violence interdiction and targeting of these offenders

o   Intensive enforcement, vertical prosecution, long presumptive sentences and rejection of parole considerations are strategies likely to have the greatest effect on these offenders.

CONCLUSIONS

What began as a drug trafficking study has taken on greater significance. The categories developed from the characteistics help guide police, prosecutors, courts and correction in dealing with the problem of crime, not simply the problem of drug trafficking. While the relationship between drugs and crime is strong, we had crime before we had serious drug problems. If we focus on drugs, we may only be focusing on a symptom of something more serious. The data show that for some offenders studied, the substance abuse of their mother or father helped explain some of their deviance. Communities in disorder must be made orderly and proactive, constructive qualify-of-life measures must be taken to reduce the possibility of the next generation becoming more

serious offenders than the current one.

Criminal histories were important in identifying the characteristics of drug traffickers. While this information was useful, it was also incomplete. Misdemeanant and juvenile records were not available, yet these data would have allowed a more complete analysis of the offenders. Consideration should be given to compiling these data for assessment and decision-making in sentencing and paroling offenders.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of this research has been the method used to assess and analyze the problem and the eclecticism of the categories within one offense group. This same methodology could and should be used to study other categories of offenders and develop strategies to use in reducing the causes of their behavior.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bayer, A. (1989). Psychological and Behavioral Traits of Entrepreneurs. Unpublished "draft" report prepared for the Police Executive Research Forum.

Bennett, W. & Hess, K. (1987). Criminal investigation, (2nd ed). St. Paul: West.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1990). Drugs and crime facts, 1989, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Estrella, S. (1989). Diagnosing crime trends. Security Management, 33(5): 80-85.

Fagan, J. (1989). The social organization of drug use and drug dealing among urban gangs. Criminology 27(4): 633-669.

Flowers, R. B. (1989). Demographics and Criminality. New York: Greenwood Printing Office.

General Statutes of North Carolina (1990). "Controlled Substances Act." Volume 12, Chapter 90 (95): 110-137.

Gilbert, J. (1986). Criminal investigation, (2nd ed). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Graham, M. (1987). Controlling drug abuse and crime: A research update. Research in Action. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.

Haapanen, R. A. (1990). Selective Incapacitation and The Serious Offender. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. (1977). Crime Analysis Systems Manual. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Manili, B. & Conners, E. (1988). Police chiefs and sheriffs rank their criminal justice needs. Research in Action. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.

Masuda, B. (1989). Doing it by the numbers. Security Management, 33(9), 195-198.

Moore, M. & Kleiman, M. (1989). The police and drugs. Perspectives on Policing. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

National Institute of Justice. (1990). 1989 drug use forecasting annual report. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.

National Institute of Justice. (1988). Characteristics of different types of drug-involved offenders. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Office of the Attorney General. (1989). Drug trafficking: A report to the President of the United States. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Reuter, P. and Haaga, J. (1989). The Organization of High-level Drug Markets: An Exploratory Study. Santa Monica: Rand.

Swanson, C., Chamelin, N., & Territo, L. (1988). Criminal investigation, (4th ed). New York: Random House.

Thornburgh, D. (1989). Letter to the President. Drug trafficking: A report to the President of the United States. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

United States v. Sokolow. (1989). 109 U. S. 1581.

Zonderman, J.   (1990).   <u>Beyond the crime lab</u>. New York: Wiley and Sons.

ATTACHMENT 1

Types of Drug Users and Offenders

National Institute of Justice

Table 1
Types of drug-involved offenders

Type of offender	Typical drug use	Typical problems	Contact with justice system
Occasional users			
Adolescents	Light to moderate or single-substance, such as alcohol, marijuana, or combination use.	Driving under influence; truancy, early sexual activity; smoking.	None to little.
Adults	Light to moderate use of single substances such as hallucinogens, tranquilizers, alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, or combination use.	Driving under influence; lowered work productivity.	None to little.
Persons who sell small amounts of drugs			
Adolescents	Moderate use of alcohol and multiple types of drugs.	Same as adolescent occasional user; also, some poor school performance; some other minor illegal activity.	Minimal juvenile justice contact.
Adults	Moderate use of alcohol and multiple types of drugs including cocaine.	Same as adult occasional user.	None to little.

(con·

(Table 1 continued)
Types of drug-involved offenders

Type of dealer	Typical drug use	Typical problems	Contact with justice system
Persons who sell drugs frequently or in large amounts			
Adolescents	Moderate to heavy use of multiple drugs including cocaine.	Many involved in range of illegal activities including violent crimes; depends on subtype (see Table 2).	Dependent on subtype (see Table 2).
Adults	Moderate to heavy use of multiple drugs including heroin and cocaine.	Depends on subtype (see Table 2).	Dependent on subtype (see Table 2).

Table 2

Types of dealers who sell drugs frequently or in large amounts

Type of dealer	Typical drug use	Typical problems	Contact with justice system
Top-level dealers			
Adults (only)	None to heavy use of multiple types of drugs.	Major distribution of drugs; some other white-collar crime such as money laundering.	Low to minimal.
Lesser predatory			
Adolescents	Moderate to heavy drug use; some addiction; heroin and cocaine use.	Assaults; range of property crimes; poor school performance.	Low to moderate contact with juvenile or adult justice system.
Adult men	Moderate to heavy drug use; some addiction; heroin and cocaine use.	Burglary and other property crimes; many drug sales; irregular employment; moderate to high social instability.	Low to high contact with criminal justice system.
Adult women	Moderate to heavy drug use; some addiction; heroin and cocaine use.	Prostitution; theft; many drug sales; addicted babies; AIDS babies; high-risk children.	Low to moderate contact with criminal justice system.

(Table 2 continued)

Types of dealers who sell drugs frequently or in large amounts

Type of dealer	Typical drug use	Typical problems	Contact with justice system
Drug-involved violent predatory offenders:			
The "losers"			
Adolescents	Heavy use of multiple drugs; often addiction to heroin or cocaine.	Commit many crimes in periods of heaviest drug use including robberies; high rates of school dropout; problems likely to continue as adults.	High contact with both juvenile and adult criminal justice system.
Adults	Heavy use of multiple drugs; often addiction to heroin or cocaine.	Commit many crimes in periods of heaviest drug use including robberies; major source of income from criminal activity; low-status roles in drug hierarchy.	High contact with criminal justice system; high incarceration.
The "winners"			
Adolescents	Frequent use of multiple drugs; less frequent addiction to heroin and cocaine	Commit many crimes; major source of income from criminal activity; take midlevel role in drug distribution to both adolescents and adults.	Minimal; low incarceration record.

(Table 2 continued)

Types of dealers who sell drugs frequently or in large amounts

Type of dealer	Typical drug use	Typical problems	Contact with justice system
Adults	Frequent use of multiple drugs; less frequent addiction to heroin and cocaine.	Commit many crimes; major source of income from criminal activity; take midlevel role in drug distribution to both adolescents and adults.	Minimal; low incarceration record.
Smugglers	None to high.	Provide pipelines of small to large quantities of drugs and money.	Variable contact.

ATTACHMENT 2

Demographic and Background Data Code Sheet

National Institute of Justice

INMATE'S NAME: _____ NUMBER: _____ DATE: _____
                    Last   First   Mi   (1-15)

IQ SCORE: _____ EDUCATION: _____   INTERVIEWER: _____ LOCATION: _____
(16-18)
ED. ACHV.: R ____.____ S ____.____ A ____.____ T ____.____
           (21-23)   (24-26)   (27-29)   (30-32)

FORMATIVE YEARS (FAMILY)

1. FAMILY STATUS (33)
- LIVED WITH BOTH PARENTS .... ☐ (1)
- LIVED WITH MOTHER .... ☐ (2)
- LIVED WITH FATHER .... ☐ (3)
- LIVED WITH RELATIVES .... ☐ (4)
- LIVED WITH FOSTER PARENTS .... ☐ (5)
- LIVED IN INSTITUTION .... ☐ (6)

2. NUMBER OF BROTHERS (34-35) .... ( )

3. NUMBER OF SISTERS (36-37) .... ( )

4. SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF FAMILY (38)
- POVERTY .... ☐ (1)
- SUBSISTANCE .... ☐ (2)
- MIDDLE INCOME .... ☐ (3)
- UPPER INCOME .... ☐ (4)

5. RESIDENCE (39)
- URBAN .... ☐ (1)
- RURAL .... ☐ (2)

6. FATHER'S PHYSICAL HEALTH (40)
- GOOD .... ☐ (1)
- FAIR .... ☐ (2)
- POOR .... ☐ (3)
- UNKNOWN .... ☐ (4)

7. FATHER'S MENTAL HEALTH (41)
- NO MENTAL PROBLEMS .... ☐ (1)
- MENTAL PROBLEMS .... ☐ (2)
- UNKNOWN .... ☐ (3)

8. FATHER'S ALCOHOL USE (42)
- NOT EXCESSIVE .... ☐ (1)
- EXCESSIVE .... ☐ (2)
- UNKNOWN .... ☐ (3)

9. FATHER'S DRUG USE (43)
- NOT EXCESSIVE .... ☐ (1)
- EXCESSIVE .... ☐ (2)
- UNKNOWN .... ☐ (3)

10. MOTHER'S PHYSICAL HEALTH (44)
- GOOD .... ☐ (1)
- FAIR .... ☐ (2)
- POOR .... ☐ (3)
- UNKNOWN .... ☐ (4)

11. MOTHER'S MENTAL HEALTH (45)
- NO MENTAL PROBLEMS .... ☐ (1)
- MENTAL PROBLEMS .... ☐ (2)
- UNKNOWN .... ☐ (3)

12. MOTHER'S ALCOHOL USE (46)
- NOT EXCESSIVE .... ☐ (1)
- EXCESSIVE .... ☐ (2)
- UNKNOWN .... ☐ (3)

13. MOTHER'S DRUG USE (47)
- NOT EXCESSIVE .... ☐ (1)
- EXCESSIVE .... ☐ (2)
- UNKNOWN .... ☐ (3)

14. IMMEDIATE FAMILY'S CRIMINAL RECORD
- NONE .... ☐ (1)
- FELON(S) .... ☐ (2)
- MISDEMEANOR(S) .... ☐ (3)
- FELON(S) & MISDEMEAÑOR(S) .... ☐ (4)

BACKGROUND

15. PHYSICAL HEALTH HISTORY (49)
- GOOD .... ☐ (1)
- FAIR .... ☐ (2)
- POOR .... ☐ (3)

16. MENTAL HEALTH HISTORY (50)
- NO MENTAL PROBLEMS .... ☐ (1)
- MENTAL PROBLEMS .... ☐ (2)

17. ALCOHOL USE (51)
- NEVER .... ☐ (1)
- OCCASIONAL .... ☐ (2)
- FREQUENT .... ☐ (3)

18. DRUG USE (52)
- NEVER .... ☐ (1)
- OCCASIONAL .... ☐ (2)
- FREQUENT .... ☐ (3)

19. DRUG TYPE (53)
- MARIJUANA .... ☐ (1)
- HEROIN .... ☐ (2)
- COCAINE .... ☐ (3)
- OTHER .... ☐ (4)
- COMBINATION .... ☐ (5)

20. ALCOHOL-DRUG USE TIME OF OFFENSE
- SOBER .... ☐ (1)
- INTOXICATED-ALCOHOL .... ☐ (2)
- INTOXICATED-DRUGS .... ☐ (3)
- INTOXICATED-ALCOHOL & DRUGS ...... ☐ (4)

21. RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION (55)
- NONE .... ☐ (1)
- PROTESTANT .... ☐ (2)
- CATHOLIC .... ☐ (3)
- JEWISH .... ☐ (4)
- MOSLEM .... ☐ (5)
- OTHER .... ☐ (6)

22. RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION (56)
- NEVER .... ☐ (1)
- OCCASIONAL .... ☐ (2)
- FREQUENT .... ☐ (3)

23. TRAINING SCHOOL RECORD (57)
- YES .... ☐ (1)
- NO .... ☐ (2)

24. MILITARY RECORD (58)
- NONE .... ☐ (1)
- ACTIVE STATUS .... ☐ (2)
- HONORABLE DISCHARGE .... ☐ (3)
- NON-HONORABLE DISCHARGE .... ☐ (4)
- MEMBER RESERVES .... ☐ (5)
- MEMBER NATIONAL GUARD .... ☐ (6)

25. OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION (59)
- NONE .... ☐ (1)
- PROFESSIONAL .... ☐ (2)
- SKILLED .... ☐ (3)
- SEMI-SKILLED .... ☐ (4)
- UNSKILLED .... ☐ (5)
- STUDENT .... ☐ (6)
- HOUSE PERSON .... ☐ (7)
- CRIMINAL ACTIVITY ONLY .... ☐ (8)

26. WORK RECORD (60)
- NONE .... ☐ (1)
- STABLE .... ☐ (2)
- UNSTABLE .... ☐ (3)

CURRENT STATUS

27. SOCIO-ECONOMIC (61)
- POVERTY .... ☐ (1)
- SUBSISTANCE .... ☐ (2)
- MIDDLE INCOME .... ☐ (3)
- UPPER INCOME .... ☐ (4)

28. MARITAL (62)
- SINGLE .... ☐ (1)
- MARRIED .... ☐ (2)
- SEPARATED .... ☐ (3)
- DIVORCED .... ☐ (4)
- WIDOWED .... ☐ (5)

29. NUMBER OF CHILDREN (63-64) .... ( )

30. RESIDENCE (65)
- URBAN .... ☐ (1)
- RURAL .... ☐ (2)

TERMINAL OPERATOR'S ID _____